

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ROBERT OGLESBY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMY LESAN, and CHAD HEIN,

Defendants.

4:16CV3189

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed another motion to strike the answer of Amy Lesan and the answer and counterclaim of Chad Hein. (Filing No. 80). Lesan's answer to the complaint and her answer to the amended complaint are, in all relevant respects, identical, (Filing Nos. 11 & 73); Hein's answer to the complaint and counterclaim, and his answer to the amended complaint and counterclaim are virtually identical, (Filing Nos. 22 & 68); and Plaintiff's pending motion to strike (Filing No. 80) repeats the arguments raised in his prior motion to strike (Filing No. 28). As such, the court's order denying Plaintiff's prior motion to strike (Filing No. 41), addresses all the arguments in Plaintiff's pending motion.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that for the reasons stated in the court's prior order, (Filing No. 41), Plaintiff's Motion to Strike the answer of Amy Lesan and the answer and counterclaim of Chad Hein, (Filing No. 80), is denied.

August 23, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Cheryl R. Zwart

United States Magistrate Judge